JP JW
HR PH

6/3/72

Mr. Ben Bradlee, Executive Editor
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Mr. Bradlee,

When you wrote that you were impressed with an article by Dr. John Lattimer in the May Resident and Staff Physician I asked that, when there might be time, you send me a copy.

In declining to answer any questions at the time of the attention to his latest medical mumbo-jumbo, he said he would send me a copy. It has now arrived and the same questions remain unanswered. So, thanks just the same, but don't go to the trouble.

When my stomach is in good shape, I'll annotate this newest rot as a matter of hostorical record. However, a glance at it makes me wonder if Lattimer impressed you or if you were seeking something you might use to justify a preconception. Especially his visual falsifications. You don't need an expert to check them. You don't even have to leave your desk.

If you don't trust your own judgement, ask your haberdasher if a shirt can possibly behave as alleged on page 37. (You may recall enough about the President to wonder if his neck was that long in front and that short in back, too.) And where is the projection of this new trajectory through Governor Connally? Remember, one bullet had to have inflicted all seven non-fatal injuries for the survival of the Warren Report or any theory of a single assassin. With this flight path, the Governor could not have been wounded as he was. Dick Harwood discussed this in a lengthy article in the Post about this time in 1966, I think the issue of May 31.

A minor point but a measure of Lattimer's personal and professional integrity is the "Figure 1" on the facing page. That is not "Courtesy of the National Archives", and this un-Lattimer language is not accidental. For example, he also claims to "own" Oswald's Marines score book, not crediting that to the Archives. This chart is carefully and dishonestly cropped (the sole purpose of using an estimate in a visual representation rather than the language of the medical evidence and conclusions). By cutting off about half of the original chart, he hs cut it so that the angle is misrepresented as flatter than the illustrator did. It is Exhibit 385. You can find it in Volume 16 or perhaps more easily on page 196 of my WHITEWASH. I photographed the Commission's page to reprint. As I remember it, the Commission also added 4° for the grade of the street and arrived at an angle of about 17°, quite different than Lattimer has always misrepresented.

I'm disappointed that a man as sharp as you goes for this kind of transparent falsehood. It is so bad it can't really be explained by Lattimer's Bircher beliefs. Your approval is no credit to your critical facilties. I haven't read anything of Lattimer's that requires detailed knowledge of the evidence to see through it.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg